

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant has carefully reviewed and considered the Office Communication mailed on September 28, 2006, and the references cited therewith.

No claims were amended, canceled, or added; as a result, claims 1-63 are now pending in this application.

Election/ Restriction

Restriction to one of the following claims was required under 35 USC 121:

- I. Claims 1-24, drawn to wireless communication system, classified in class 455, subclass 562.1.
- II. Claims 25-38, drawn to multi-beam directed signal system, classified in class 375, subclass 267.
- III. Claims 39-59, drawn to coordinating directed wireless communication, classified in class 343, subclass 754.
- IV. Claims 60-63, drawn to associating a client device with a directed communication beam, classified in class 343, subclass 754.

Applicant provisionally elects, with traverse, to prosecute the invention of Group I, and claims 1-24. The Election/Restriction Requirement is traversed, at least in part, on the basis that restriction requirements are optional in all cases. MPEP §803. As the section further states, if the search and examination of all the claims in an application can be made without serious burden, the Examiner must examine it on the merits.

In section 2 of the Detailed Action of the present Office Communication, the Examiner presented “the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability” as a requirement for restriction of “Inventions I, II, III, and IV” (i.e., claims 1-24, claims 25-38, claims 39-59, and claims 60-63, respectively). The Examiner goes on to say, “the specifics of multi-beam directed signal system are not needed for a wireless system antenna assembly.” Applicant respectfully notes that independent claims of groups I, II, and

III (i.e., claims 1, 25, 39, and 49, respectively) all claim “coordinate(ing) directed wireless communication” from “an antenna assembly” and the multi-beam directed signal system of group II (claim 25) is “configured to coordinate directed wireless communication.” Therefore, Applicant respectfully notes that the multi-beam directed signal system (directed wireless communication) is used with a wireless system antenna assembly (antenna assembly) in each of the groups I, II, and III.

As such, Applicant respectfully submits that the separate groups I, II, III, and IV do not require different fields of search. In addition, it is submitted that the Examiner will be uncovering similar art in searching the various groups and Applicant should not be required to incur the additional costs associated with the filing of multiple applications in order to obtain protection for the claimed subject matter. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the Election/Restriction Requirement, and that claims 1-63 be examined on the merits together.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney at (612) 236-0120 to facilitate prosecution of this matter.


CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR §1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: MS AMENDMENT Commissioner of Patents, P.O. BOX 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on this 18th day of October, 2006.

Alison L. Subendam
Name


Signature

Respectfully Submitted,
Marcus da Silva, et al.

By their Representatives,
BROOKS & CAMERON, PLLC
1221 Nicollet Avenue, Suite 500
Minneapolis, MN 55403

By: 
Edward J. Brooks III
Reg. No. 40,925

Date: 10/18/2006